

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY****40 CFR Part 52**

[A-5-FRL 1682-1]

**State and Federal Administrative Orders Revising the Michigan State Implementation Plan****AGENCY:** U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.**ACTION:** Proposed Rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** On December 10, 1979, the State of Michigan submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) a proposed revision to the Michigan State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revision is a Final Order issued by the Michigan Air Pollution Control Commission (Commission) which extends the compliance date until January 1, 1985 for the Consumers Power Company's B.C. Cobb plant to meet the State of Michigan's sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) emission limitations. The purpose of this notice is to invite public comment on USEPA's proposed approval of this revision to the Michigan SIP.

**DATE:** Written comments must be received by December 26, 1980.

**ADDRESS:** Please send comments to: Gary Gulezian, Chief, Regulatory Analysis Section, Air Programs Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604 (312) 886-6038.

The State Order, supporting materials and public comments received in response to this notice may be inspected and copied (for appropriate charges) during normal business hours at the above address.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Judy Kertcher, Regulatory Analysis Section, Air Programs Branch, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region V, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604 (312) 886-6038.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Cobb Plant is located in Muskegon, Michigan on Muskegon Lake, approximately five miles east of Lake Michigan. Muskegon, Michigan is designated as attaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for sulfur dioxide at 40 CFR Part 81. The Cobb Plant consists of five coal-fired steam electric generating units having a total rating of 510 megawatts. The plant's emissions were discharged through five 76.2 meter (m) stacks until August 1975 when a new 198.2 m stack was constructed for the discharge of the combined emissions from all five units. In September 1978, the Company requested an extension from January 1,

1980 until January 1, 1985 for the B.C. Cobb Plant to meet the SO<sub>2</sub> emission limitation in Michigan Rule 336.1401. For the purpose of demonstrating attainment and maintenance of the SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS, a good engineering practice (GEP) stack height of 163.1 m was used in the dispersion modeling analysis submitted to USEPA. The GEP stack height was calculated using the formula proposed by USEPA on January 12, 1979 (44 FR 2608).

The Michigan Air Pollution Control Commission (Commission) and the Company entered into a Stipulation for Entry of a Consent Order which was incorporated into a Final Order of the Commission. On December 10, 1979, Michigan submitted the Final Order to the USEPA as a revision to the Michigan SIP.

The proposed SIP revision, Final Order APC No. 6-1979, extends the compliance date for the B.C. Cobb Plant from January 1, 1980 to January 1, 1985 for meeting the sulfur dioxide emission limitations in Tables 41 and 42 of MAPCC Rule 336.1401. Any Order which has been issued to a major source and extends the SIP compliance date for meeting the sulfur dioxide emission limitations must be approved by USEPA before it becomes effective as a SIP revision under the Clean Air Act. The proposed revision allows a five year extension of the compliance date of the Michigan SIP Rule 336.1401 for the five units at the B.C. Cobb Plant.

The Order contains the following provisions:

**A. Sulfur Dioxide Emission Limitations:**

(1) Beginning on January 1, 1980 and continuing to January 1, 1985 fuel burned at the Cobb Plant shall not:

(a) On an annual average exceed 2.5 percent sulfur content by weight at 12,000 BTU/pound of coal.

(b) Result in sulfur dioxide emissions not greater than 386 tons on any calendar day. This emission limitation is the equivalent of burning coal which averages 3.5 percent sulfur content by weight at 12,000 BTU/pound of coal and 510 megawatts net load for 24 hours.

(c) On a daily average result in emissions of sulfur dioxide not greater than a rate of 7.0 pounds per million BTU heat input.

(2) After January 1, 1985 emissions of sulfur dioxide from the Cobb Plant shall not exceed the levels prescribed in Tables 3 and 4 of Rule 336.49 (Tables 41 and 42 of revised Rule 336.1401, effective January 17, 1980), unless an alternate date for compliance with the levels is established by the Commission.

**B. Sulfur Dioxide Control Program:**

(1) By January 1, 1980 the Company shall submit to the Commission an acceptable control strategy which shall provide for compliance with Section A(2) of the Order.

(2) If the Company elects to burn low sulfur coal as the method of control, the Company shall by January 1, 1981 and by each January 1 for the following three (3) years:

(a) Notify the Commission that it has under contract or contract option the low sulfur coal necessary to meet the requirements of Section A(2) of the Order; or

(b) Notify the Commission, with acceptable explanation, that adequate quantities of low sulfur coal are available for acquisition for use in the Cobb Plant by January 1, 1985.

(3) If low sulfur coal is chosen as the method of control, the Company shall notify the Commission of the signing of any contracts for such coal within thirty (30) days for their signing.

(4) If the Company elects a control strategy other than low sulfur coal burning, a report on the method of control (including increments of progress) shall be provided to the Commission by January 1, 1980. If a control strategy other than low sulfur coal burning is submitted, it is the intent of the Company and the Commission to incorporate the elements of the Control strategy into either a new or amended order.

(5) By January 1, 1981 and by each January 1 for the following three (3) years, the Company shall submit to the Commission a report of the Company's progress toward complying with the Order. Any developments which would preclude compliance with any provision of the Order shall be immediately reported in writing to the Commission.

**C. monitoring and Data Reporting:**

(1) The Company shall operate four (4) ambient sulfur dioxide monitors around the Cobb Plant in such manner and at such locations as reasonably specified by the Chief of the Air Quality Division of the Department of Natural Resources (hereinafter "Staff").

(2) The Company shall perform a weekly sulfur analysis of fuel burned in the Cobb Plant in accordance with the procedures specified in Appendix A.

(3) The Company shall by January 1, 1980 install and place in operation stack gas emission monitor(s) for measuring sulfur dioxide that meets the performance specifications of Appendix B of 40 CFR Part 60 (1977).

(4) The Company shall demonstrate the adequacy of the stack gas sulfur dioxide monitor(s) in accordance with the procedures specified in Appendix B of 40 CFR Part 60 (1977).

(5) For each calendar day during which the stack gas sulfur dioxide monitor(s) has been inoperative for 12 consecutive hours, the Company shall conduct a daily analysis of the coal burned at the Cobb Plant according to the procedures specified in Appendix A. This daily analysis shall be discontinued only after the stack gas sulfur dioxide monitor(s) has operated acceptably for 12 consecutive hours during a calendar day.

(6) The Company shall report to the Staff sulfur dioxide emissions in terms of pounds of sulfur dioxide per million BTU heat input in accordance with the procedures specified in Appendix B of 40 CFR Part 60 (1977).

(7) The Company shall submit to the Staff data from the aforementioned ambient air quality monitors, stack gas monitor(s), and fuel sulfur analysis in such format and at such intervals as reasonably specified.

(8) During the first quarter of 1980 and at approximately 18-month intervals thereafter, the Company shall conduct periodic particulate emission tests for each unit of the Cobb Plant. The tests shall be conducted in accordance with Commission approved procedures.

(9) The monitoring and reporting requirements specified in or pursuant to Subsections C(1) through (8) shall be, upon request of the Company, reviewed by the Commission and modified if the Commission finds such modifications are justified.

The Final Order contained the following appendix:

#### Appendix A—Fuel Analysis Procedures

##### 1. Weekly Fuel Analysis:

a. A minimum of three equally spaced grab samples of the coal burned at the Cobb Plant shall be taken each calendar day.

b. A weekly composite coal sample shall be prepared for analysis from the grab samples according to ASTM or equivalent methods for each calendar day that the daily fuel analysis is required.

c. The composite coal sample shall be analyzed for sulfur heat (BTU) content according to ASTM or equivalent methods approved by the Chief of the Air Quality Division.

An air quality study was submitted to the USEPA on behalf of Consumers Power Company. The study used non-reference modeling techniques and employed a point source gaussian plume air quality model developed by Consumers Power Company's consultant. The model used in the analysis is not included as a reference model in *GUIDELINE ON AIR QUALITY MODELS* (EPA 450/2-78-027), April,

1978. Consequently, USEPA performed an air quality modeling analysis to ensure that approval of the variance for B.C. Cobb will not cause or contribute to a violation of the SO<sub>2</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Based on its analysis employing a reference model (MPTR) with five years of meteorological data (1973-1977), USEPA concluded that the SIP revision for B.C. Cobb will not cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS. The State has indicated that it is relying upon fuel analysis to determine the Company's compliance with the Order. This is acceptable to USEPA.

Under the revised stack height policy, published June 24, 1980 (45 FR 42279), sources seeking credit for raising existing stacks will be required to provide a fluid modeling or field study demonstration that the stack height increase is necessary to avoid excessive concentrations due to downwash, wakes and eddies. Consumers Power did not submit an adequate demonstration that the stack height increase from 76.2m to 198.2m is necessary to avoid aerodynamic downwash at the B.C. Cobb Plant. Therefore, USEPA performed an additional air quality analysis using the 76.2m height of the old stack and the stack design parameters associated with the new stack (198.2m). The modeling analysis demonstrated that no additional stack height credit was necessary to demonstrate attainment of the SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS. Therefore, fluid modeling is not required to support the revision to the Michigan SIP.

USEPA proposes to approve this revision to the Michigan SIP, and solicits public comment on the revision and on USEPA's proposed approval. All interested persons are invited to submit comments to the address listed in the front of this notice. Public comments received on or before (30 days from date of publication) will be considered in USEPA's final rulemaking. All comments received will be available for inspection at the Region V Air Programs Branch, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60604. After the public comment period, the Administrator of USEPA will publish in the Federal Register the Agency's final action on the proposed SIP revision. Under Executive Order 12044 (43 FR 12661), USEPA is required to judge whether a regulation is "significant" and, therefore, subject to certain procedural requirements of the Order or whether it may follow other specialized development procedures. USEPA labels proposed regulations as "specialized." I have reviewed these proposed regulations pursuant to the

guidance in USEPA's response to Executive Order 12044, "Improving Environmental Regulations," signed March 29, 1979 by the Administrator and I have determined that they are specialized regulations not subject to the procedural requirements of Executive Order 12044.

This proposed rulemaking is issued under the authority of Section 110 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410).

Dated: October 31, 1980.

John McGuire,  
Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 80-36908 Filed 11-25-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6550-38-M

#### 40 CFR Part 52

[A-S-FRL 1681-5]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan: Minnesota

AGENCY: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) today proposes approval of revisions to the Minnesota State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the Twin Cities and Rochester sulfur dioxide nonattainment areas. The State submitted these proposed revisions to USEPA to satisfy the requirements of Part D of the Clean Air Act (Act). The State transmitted the Twin Cities sulfur dioxide plan on May 7, 1980 and amended it on June 17, 1980. The State submitted the Rochester sulfur dioxide plan on July 15, 1980. On August 4, 1980 the State resubmitted both sulfur dioxide plans and the June 17, 1980 submission. A correction to the August 4, 1980 submission was submitted to USEPA on September 4, 1980.

The purpose of today's notice is to discuss the results of USEPA's review of the proposed revisions; to propose approval and to invite public comment.

**DATE:** Comments on this revision and on the proposed USEPA action on the revisions are due by December 26, 1980.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the proposed SIP revision are available at the following addresses for inspection:

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Air Programs Branch, Region V, 230 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

United States Environmental Protection Agency, Public Information Reference Unit, 401 M Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20460

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, 1935 West County Road B-2, Roseville, Minnesota 55113.